Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/595,583	MIZE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Yelena G. Gakh, Ph.D.	1743
All Participants:	Status of Application	:
(1) Yelena G. Gakh, Ph.D.	(3)	
(2) Jennifer J. Taylor, Ph.D.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 19 February 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
Part I.		· ·
Rejection(s) discussed: established in the previous Office actions		
Claims discussed: all pending claims		
Prior art documents discussed: recited in the previous Office actions		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summ 	The examiner will provide a e record of the substance o	of the interview, since the interview
Meloro Hale	•. •	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Application	ant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the applicant explained the recitation of claim 40 regarding "modifying a light absorbing property" of impurities, which the examiner misinterpreted. The examiner agreed that clarified recitation could be the basis for allowing this group of claims. The examiner indicated that the preambles of other independent claims (14 and 35) do not correspond neither the subject matter recited in the bodies of the claims, nor the enabling scopes of the claims, to which the applicant disagreed. The examiner will write a new Office action with all remaining unresolved issues clearly expressed.